PATENT

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-19 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are independent. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments may be found on page 6, lines 16-19 and page 7 lines 6-10 of the originally filed specification.

Personal Interview Conducted

The Applicant's wish to thank Examiner Pannala for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on January 11, 2006. During the interview, claim 1, the proposed amendment thereto, and the prior art of record, specifically Dan and Alexander, were discussed. The Examiner would not comment on the prior art of record's applicability to the proposed amendment. Nonetheless, the Examiner suggested including the language of the proposed amendment into the body of the claim and indicated that it would be given further consideration. The proposed amendment to the preamble is not included in the body of the claims of the amendment submitted herein because the features of the proposed amendment were already included in the body of the previously presented claims, as further explained below.

Objection To The Claims

Claim 20 was objected to in the previous Office Action. Applicant's believe the objection is now moot in view of the fact that claim 20 is cancelled herein.

PATENT   Atty Docket No.: 10014137-1
                                                App. Ser. No.: 10/052,334

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103

The test for determining if a claim is rendered obvious by one or more references for

purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is set forth in MPEP § 706.02(j):

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria
> must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation,
> either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally
> available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference
> or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a
> reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference
> (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim
> limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed
> combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both
> be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In
> re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Therefore, if the above-identified criteria are not met, then the cited reference(s) fails

to render obvious the claimed invention and, thus, the claimed invention is distinguishable

over the cited reference(s).

The Official Action sets forth a rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-19 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the disclosure contained in Dan

(6,560,639) in view of Alexander (6,732,331). This rejection is respectfully traversed

because Dan considered singly or in combination with Alexander fails to teach or suggest all

of the elements of Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15-19.

A brief description of the claims may be beneficial to the following response. Claim

1 will be described as representative of independent claims 7, 13, and 19. Claim 1 recites, in

part, "a site having pages with a common appearance that allows data contained in each page

of the site to be changed without changing each page of the site individually." Previously

presented and current features of claim 1 include: "a tag embedded in each page of a multiple

page site," "a script called from within each tag," wherein "each script called from each of

PATENT

the tags calls the same page configuration information." Also, as claim 1 previously stated, "a change made to the page configuration information called by each of the scripts results in the same changed appearance for each page of the site."

As discussed during the interview, using the same tag in each web page calling the same database script for retrieving web page information *i.e.*, page configuration information, allows a user to make a change once to the page configuration information and the same changes are automatically made to each of the web pages. This results from the system of claim 1 because, as claim 1 previously stated, each tag calls the same page configuration information.

As discussed in the previous response, Dan does not teach or suggest several features of claim 1. Initially, Dan fails to teach a system "that allows data contained in each page of a site to be changed without changing each page of the site individually." During the interview, the Examiner admitted that he could not point to a teaching in either Dan or Alexander that could allegedly disclose this feature. However, the Examiner indicated that Dan and Alexander would have to be reviewed more carefully. It is the Applicant's position that neither Dan nor Alexander teach or suggest this feature. Dan and Alexander may teach modifying a web page, but both teach that the pages must be modified individually and both fail to teach modifying a page in the manner described by claim 1.

Dan fails to teach a tag embedded in each page of a multiple page site. The Office Action alleges that this feature is disclosed by Dan in Fig. 24, column 10 line 3-4, column 26 lines 7-11, and column 29 lines 61-63. Fig. 24 is a "schematic of the computer and its peripherals." Fig. 24 illustrates a "display" and a "display interface," but does not teach a

PATENT

web page, and certainly does not illustrate a tag embedded in each page of a multiple page site.

Column 10 lines 3-4 recites "a page generally includes any linked file in an internet." This passage of Dan is merely defining what a web page is. However, the Official Action seems to interpret the word "linked" as referring to a tag. This interpretation of Dan is incorrect. This passage is best understood when read in conjunction with the first half of the paragraph in column 9 lines 61-67. The paragraph defines "web presence" as a "related collection of linked files, which is non-geographically limited." Dan uses the term "linked" simply to refer to the fact that all web pages are somehow connected, such that a user could move from one web page to another in a common web site. This passage does not teach the same tag or the same link embedded in each page.

Column 26 lines 7-11 refers to a procedure for adding an entire web page to a site. The passage states that a user may generate the page or create the page in a database, which can later be regenerated into the site. This passage refers to creation of an entire page, not a tag or any content within an existing page. Thus, this passage is not analogous to any features contained in claim 1.

Column 29 lines 61-63 states that the hardware configuration of Dan may be arranged according to the multiple instruction multiple data multiprocessor format for additional computing efficiency. It is not clear how this passage relates to the features of claim 1 and the Office Action does not explain why this passage was cited. Therefore, Dan fails to teach a tag embedded in each page of a site and the passages cited in the Office Action fail to support the allegation that Dan discloses this feature.

PATENT

Dan also fails to teach a database script to be called from within each tag. The Office Action claims that this feature is disclosed by Dan in Fig. 2 and column 11 lines 28-29. Fig. 2 illustrates a front end daemon connected to a webserver and a back end daemon connected to database and the front end daemon. The Office Action alleges that the statement "the web management system scans the site's database for scripts" is analogous to the feature of claim 1. This passage specifically states that "the web management system 30" searches the database for scripts. As Fig. 2 illustrates the web management system 30 is the front and back end daemons. In contrast to Dan, claim 1 recites that a script is called from within a tag in each page of a web site. The front and back end daemons of Dan are not tags in each page of a web site. The cited passage of Dan is almost opposite of the feature recited in claim 1, which states that a tag, which is embedded in each page of a site, calls the script, not a web management system. Therefore, Dan fails to teach or suggest a script to be called from within each tag.

Dan also fails to teach or suggest that "a change made to the page configuration information called by each of the scripts results in the same changed appearance of each page of the site." The Office Action alleges that this feature is disclosed by Dan in column 26 lines 9-11. It is respectfully submitted that this passage was not accurately interpreted and understood in the Office Action. The passage states that when a page is added to a site, the user can enter the new page into a database and regenerate the entire site at a later time. As discussed above, the passage provides a message of adding entire pages to a site. It refers to the practice of adding the new page to the database and later "regenerating" or refreshing the site so that all the new changes made in the database are reflected in the site. This passage in no way refers to a change made to page configuration information which results in the same

PATENT   Atty Docket No.: 10014137-1
                                              App. Scr. No.: 10/052,334

changed appearance to each page of a site. The cited passage merely states that when a change is made to a page of the site, the entire site must be refreshed for the change to appear.

The Office Action concedes that Dan fails to teach that the script called from each of the tags calls the same configuration information. The Office Action alleges that Alexander rectifies this deficiency in column 1 lines 48-55 and 59-61 and column 2 lines 36-40. Alexander refers to modifying content in web pages through the use of a back end template, so that content can be changed without the complications of changing code. However, Alexander fails to teach making a change, which would result in the same change to each page of a site because Alexander fails to teach a script called from each of the tags calls the same configuration information. In Alexander, each page must be changed individually.

Independent claims 7, 13 and 19 recite features similar to the features of claim 1 described above. Thus, at least for the reasons set forth above, Claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-19 are believed to be allowable over Dan in view of Alexander, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 10014137-1
App. Ser. No.: 10/052,334

<u>Conclusion</u>

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 13, 2006   By   _____
                                         Ashok Mannava
                                         Registration No.: 45, 301

                                         MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
                                         8221 Old Courthouse Road
                                         Suite 104
                                         Vienna, VA 22182
                                         (703) 652-3822
                                         (703) 880-5270 (fax)